DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 534 IR 003 618

AUTHOR Bowen, Daniel John
TITLE The Quality of Library Education: A Survey.
PUB DATE May 76
NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Research; Field Experience Programs; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Librarians; *Library Education; Masters Degrees; Participant Satisfaction; *Relevance (Education)
IDENTIFIERS California (San Francisco Bay Area)

ABSTRACT

A study was made to determine the usefulness of library education as seen by 40 practicing academic, special, and public librarians in the southern San Francisco Bay Area (California). Interview questions were designed to discover librarians' positions and backgrounds; the usefulness of courses they took in library schools; their opinions on field work, length of program, and required courses; and their assessment of the overall quality of their library education. Results indicated that librarians felt their education prepared them adequately, that field work was beneficial, and that a core curriculum of basic reference and cataloging was desirable. However, library schools could improve in the areas of effective use of time, teaching techniques, the balance between the practical and the theoretical, and keeping professors up-to-date. More coursework was wanted in management, automation, and specialized areas such as acquisitions and serials. (LS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125534

THE QUALITY OF LIBRARY EDUCATION: A SURVEY

A Research Paper
Submitted to
the Faculty of the Department of Librarianship
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Daniel John Bowen

May 1976

IR 003 618

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Stuart Baillie for all of his help and encouragement during this project and during my years at San Jose State University. I would also like to thank all of the librarians who took time out of their jobs to participate in this survey and to the supervisors and library directors who allowed them to participate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 2

2. METHODOLOGY 10

THE SAMPLE 12

3. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS 14

THE RESPONDENTS 14

THE RESPONSES 20

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 53

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 55

BIBLIOGRAPHY 57

APPENDIX

A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 60

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Respondents by Type of Library	14
2.	Professional Experience of Respondents . . .	15
3.	Number of Respondents by Position Held . . .	16
4.	Library Schools Attended by Respondents . .	17
5.	Areas of Concentration in Library School by Respondents	18
6.	Degrees Held by Respondents	19
7.	Courses Named Most Useful by Respondents	22
8.	Courses Respondents Named Most Useful (Grouped by Similarities)	25
9.	Courses Named Least Useful by Respondents	27
10.	Courses Respondents Named Least Useful (Grouped by Similarities)	29
11.	Areas Named by Respondents as Not Covered in Library School	32
12.	Areas Named by Respondents as Not Covered in Library School (Grouped by Similarities)	35
13.	Did Respondent Participate in Field Work . .	39
14.	Would Field Work Be Useful for Any Library Student	39
15.	Is a Calendar Year Long Enough for Library School	41

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
16.	Would a Four Semester/Six Quarter Program Be Beneficial	42
17.	Courses Respondents Thought Should Be Required	43
18.	How Respondents Rated Their Library School Education	48

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Each year many changes are taking place in libraries, and many new problems arise: atuomation is becoming more prevalent in all types of libraries; fiscal problems are ever present; unions are playing greater roles in the decisions made in libraries; and the library's place in the community is still being defined. With changes and problems affecting libraries the profession needs librarians who are trained to meet such challenges. Yet many people would say we are not educating our new librarians to adequately meet the challenges of the future, as Allen Hershfield points out, "With the exception of a few new courses in information science and non-print media, most library schools' curricula have remained unchanged since the 1920's."[1] Neal Harlow adds, ". . . Basic education for librarianship today can be seen more as an intelligent report upon society at the turn of the century than as a program for the 1970's."[2] The question then becomes how well is our library education system doing in its attempts to prepare librarians to meet the needs of libraries of the present and future.

Statement of the Problem

Judging from the literature on library education there has been little research done on the adequacy of library education for helping librarians to meet the needs of today's libraries. Harold Borko conducted a study to determine what were the most important areas of research needed in library education. The area named named number one was "To investigate current library school education and its relationship to the knowledge and skills required by librarians during their first five years on the job."[3] This study hopes to take a first step in that direction.

The purpose of this study is to find out from practicing professional librarians how well they were prepared to do the jobs they hold in libraries, and to ask them to evaluate the advantages of field work, the length of the library school program, and the need for required courses. Last, they will be asked for any recommendations or comments they may have on improving library education. Hence, the hypothesis for this study:

> PRACTICING LIBRARIANS CAN PROVIDE THE INFORMATION NEEDED TO ENABLE LIBRARY EDUCATORS TO CHANGE AND IMPROVE LIBRARY SCHOOL CURRICULA.

Review of the Literature

Two studies were found which paralleled the present one; one was conducted in the Cornell University

Library and published in the Cornell University Library Bulletin[4] and the other was done by the Graduate School of Library Science at Drexel University.[5]

The purpose of the Cornell study was to evaluate library school curricula and solicit suggestions for its improvement. A total of eighty-seven of the 135 librarians responded to the questionnaire; which represented thirty-four different library schools. The number of years they were employed as professionals ranged from under one year to over twenty-one years. When asked the most interesting course taken in library school the two top courses mentioned were reference (eighteen people) and history of the book (sixteen people). This was followed by a question on why they thought the course was interesting with forty-two listing subject matter, nineteen listing the instructor, and twenty-three listing both. They were then asked how useful the course (most interesting course) was in their present job on a scale of one to seven with one signifying useless and seven most useful. The results were:[6]

USEFULNESS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
1	10
2	12
3	7
4	12
5	14
6	11
7	14

When they were asked to rate, on the same scale, the usefulness of their overall curriculum in library school the results were as follows:[7]

USEFULNESS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
1	5
2	9
3	4
4	16
5	16
6	7
7	11

One final interesting aspect of this study was the last question, asking for changes that should be made to improve library education. A high percentage of the respondents mentioned the need to teach management in library schools.

The Drexel study was limited to graduates of their library school who were employed in urban public libraries and had graduated in the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. There were a total of forty-seven respondents to the study which used both the mail questionnaire and interview techniques. The respondents represented twenty-four libraries in ten different states and the District of Columbia. They were asked to comment on five areas: preparation for their job, usefulness of required courses, most useful elective courses, the value of field work, and evaluation of library school faculty.

The primary concern about library school preparation for the job was the need to know how to serve the community more effectively. Other areas mentioned that were lacking in their preaparation were "awareness of existing community services, activities, and politics; ways to supply information services to community agencies, organizations, and firms; familiarity with non-book multimedia approaches to communication; social responsibilities of libraries; service to the disadvantaged; and reading guidance to individual patrons."[8]

The reference courses were listed as the most useful of the required courses. These included basic reference and advanced reference courses in social sciences, humanities, and science and technology. The cataloging and book selection courses were thought to be the least useful. The Library Administration course was criticized for being irrelevant and impractical and should contain more practical aspects of library work such as supervision, personnel handling, budgeting, and library management.

The elective courses thought to be of most use to the urban public librarian included, "Introduction to Information Science, Public Relations Workshop, Audio-Visual Services, Adult Education and the Library, Popular Literature, Public Library Service, and Selection of Materials for Children and Young People."[9]

Eighty-one percent of the respondents felt that supervised field work was valuable for those who have not had previous experience in libraries. The benefits mentioned centered around the exposure to metropolitan library situations and learning how to deal with them.

Some of the respondents criticized the faculty for "ivory-tower" attitudes and felt that some of the faculty had lost touch with the day to day problems and decisions in which the librarian is involved. Innovative teaching methods such as role playing and use of video taped simulation exercises were praised.

Other than these two studies, none could be found that resembled the present undertaking. It has been said that other library schools have conducted studies similar to that of Drexel University's Graduate School of Library Science but the results of those studies have not been published.

Two other studies that relate to this study were found. The first was conducted by James Kortendick and Elizabeth Stone and focused on the continuing education needs of federal librarians.[10] Although this study dealt only with continuing education, the results that pertain to course work needed by those librarians are interesting. The librarians were asked to choose from a list of ninety-five courses the ones they thought they needed. The most prevalently mentioned areas of course work were in automation and management. This certainly has bearing upon

the present study. It will be interesting to compare this response to the responses of the subjects of this study on areas that were not covered in library school.

The second study was a Ph.D. thesis done by Anna C. Hall at the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences.[11] The purpose of her study was to determine the skills and knowledge needed by professional librarians in the public service area of a public library; and to ascertain if the skills and knowledge could be obtained through course work at selected library schools. Her conclusions prove very interesting:

> CONCLUSION I
> A number of important subject knowledges which librarians identified as of particualr importance were not, for the most part, being taught in library schools. Even though these knowledges draw heavily from the disciplines of sociology; psychology and human relations; communication; management; and education, they are of such import to professional librarians in providing service to modern-day urban areas that assurance of their acquisition should be considered by library education.
>
> CONCLUSION II
> Library schools were covering the subject knowledges traditionally considered unique to the profession of librarianship and so defined in this study, such as cataloging, classification, etc.
>
> CONCLUSION III
> Even where recognition was being given to the importance of knowledges in related areas mentioned in Conclusion I, the instruction was generally not beyond the awareness level. Neither the principles of the disciplines themselves nor the techniques of utilization of these principles was being taught.
>
> CONCLUSION IV
> A number of the courses developing higher skills were electives, such as some of those in research methodology, auto-mation, and administration. Thus,

many students may have missed the available opportunities to develop these higher skills which did exist in curricula of library schools.

CONCLUSION V
Although objectives as stated in school catalogs, and as defined by instructors, indicated an intention to develop the more complex intellectual skills, the emphasis in actual teaching (with the exception of a few specialized areas, such as courses in research methodology, automation, selection and library materials) was largely upon factual information to the relative neglect of other desirable levels of achievement.[12]

The implication here is this: librarians need skills and knowledge which are not covered -- at least not adequately covered -- in library schools.

The results and methodologies from these studies have influenced the design of this current study as will be seen in the next chapter.

REFERENCES

1. A.F. Hershfield, Effecting Change in Library Education, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 082778, 1973, p. 11.

2. N. Harlow, "Designs on the Curriculum," Education for Librarianship: The Design of the Curriculum of Library Schools, ed. H. Goldhor (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1971), p. 123.

3. H. Borko, ed., Targets for Research in Library Education (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), p. 216.

4. "Education for Librarianship," Cornell University Library Bulletin, January/February, 1972.

5. D. Mariani, "The Library School Curriculum -- Is it Relevant?," PLA Bulletin, September 1970, pp. 269-277.

6. "Education for Librarianship," op. cit., p. 26.

7. Ibid.

8. Mariani, op. cit., p. 271.

9. Ibid., p. 274.

10. J. Kortendick and E. Stone, Job Dimensions and Educational Needs in Librarianship (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971).

11. A.C. Hall, Selected Educational Objectives for Public Service Librarians: A Taxonomic Approach (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, 1968).

12. Ibid., pp. 152-153.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

The interview technique was chosen as the most compatible to the purposes and constraints of this study. It was felt that the interview had advantages over the questionnaire in that the interviewer would be present to clarify any misunderstandings of the questions and to more effectively probe into the reasons for the answers. Financial and time limitations also necessitated the use of the interview.

The interview schedule was constructed with four basic sections. The first was to identify the individual being interviewed and his background. The questions included:

What type of library are you now working in?

What postion do you hold in that library?

How long have you been in that position?

How many years have you been a professional librarian?

What library school did you attend?

What year did you graduate from library school?

What was your area of concentration in library school?

What other degrees besides librarianship do you hold? (Include both bachelors and masters)

No identification of any person was asked for on the interview schedule and each person was told that no names were to be used in the study.

The second section of the interview schedule dealt with the interviewees' opinions on the usefulness of the courses he took in library school and on areas that should have been covered in library school but were not. The actual questions asked were these:

> What courses that you took in library school were the most helpful to you in your first years of librarianship? Why?
>
> Which courses did you find to be of least use to you? Why?
>
> What areas of your work do you feel should have been covered by course work in library school but were not?

The purposes of these questions were to gain some idea of the courses that aided the practicing librarian the most in his job and those that did not aid him; and to find out what areas of his job were not supported by formal course work.

The third section contained questions dealing with topics that are currently being debated within the library education field. These areas included field work, the length of the masters degree program, and required courses. The questions were stated thus:

> Did you participate in field work?
>
> Do you think field work would be useful for any library student?

In your opinion is the present calendar year program used by most library schools a sufficiently long enough program to train a beginning librarian?

Would you favor a four semester/six quarter program?

Which courses should be required to be taken by all library students? Why?

The last section contained questions on the overall quality of the person's library education, and another asked for any other comments on library education in general. The questions read:

Overall how would you rate your library school education as it related to preparing you for your first years in librarianship?

Do you have any other comments about library education?

The interview schedule was tested before the actual study began to determine if the questions could be understood and if the answers to the questions were compatible with the purposes of the study. Preliminary interviews were conducted with two librarians and questions were adjusted to more closely meet the needs of the study. The final interview schedule appears in Appendix A.

The Sample

Limitations were put on the sample to make the study more manageable. Geographically the librarians interviewed were restricted to the southern San Francisco Bay Area. The sample included librarians from academic, special, and public libraries. It was decided also to

limit the sample to those who had graduated from library school in the last ten years, because anyone out of library school longer than that would have trouble remembering the specific courses taken in library school; also the courses would have changed over the years. There was no limitation as to the area of the library that a person could work in, so technical services and public services were both represented. In each library permission was obtained from either the head librarian or the personnel librarian to speak to the people in the library.

Chapter 3

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The Respondents

The interviews took three weeks to complete, the total number of librarians interviewed was forty. The breakdown by type of library is as follows: twenty-seven from academic libraries, eight from public libraries, and five from special libraries. The larger number of librarians from the academic field stems from the fact that each academic library contained many more librarians to interview than most public or special libraries; consequently visting only a few academic libraries generated quite a few interviews. Some bias may be realized from the disproportionate number of academic librarians, yet there are enough public and special librarians to balance the study.

Table 1

Respondents by Type of Library

Type of Library	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Academic	27	67.5%
Public	8	20.0
Special	5	12.5

The distribution of years of professional experience (Table 2) that each librarian had, ranged from less than one year to ten years with the average falling at 4.6 years.

Table 2

Professional Experience of Respondents (N= 40)

Years of Experience	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Less than 1 year	2	5.0%
1	2	5.0
2	6	15.0
3	5	12.5
4	7	17.5
5	3	7.5
6	5	12.5
7	2	5.0
8	2	5.0
9	3	7.5
10	3	7.5

The positions held (Table 3) cover all library departments. The distribution includes a range from the beginning position up to the department head.

The library schools attended by the forty numbered

Table 3

Number of Respondents by Positions Held (N= 40)

Position Held	Number of Respondents	Perdentage
Reference[1]	20	50.0%
Cataloging	9	22.5
Acquisitions[1]	2	5.0
Serials	2	5.0
File Manager	1	2.5
Government Documents	1	2.5
Head Circulation	1	2.5
Head Technical Services	1	2.5
Head Engineering Branch	1	2.5
Head Gift and Exchange	1	2.5
Media Supervisor	1	2.5

[1]One position one-half time reference, one-half time acquisitions.

twenty-three. (Table 4) Three of the schools were attended by librarians in the beginning of their course work only, and all three of the librarians finished their work at San Jose State. The two largest groupings are quite naturally from San Jose State and the University of California, Berkeley, since the interviews took place in the San Francisco Bay Area. Geographically, each part of the

Table 4

Library Schools Attended by Respondents (N= 40)

Library School	Number of Respondents	Percentage
San Jose State	16	40.0%
Berkeley	10	25.0
Denver	2	5.0
Syracuse	2	5.0
USC	2	5.0
Washington	2	5.0
Atlanta	1	2.5
Case Western	1	2.5
Kent State	1	2.5
Oregon	1	2.5
Rosary	1	2.5
Rutgers	1	2.5
Arizona[1]	1	
Drexel[1]	1	
North Texas State[1]	1	

[1]Three respondents started their course work at these three schools and completed it at San Jose State.

country is represented by at least one library school.

Areas of concentration (by type of librarianship) ranged over all four areas: special, academic, school,

and public. (Table 5) Although twenty-seven interviewees were working in an academic library, only twenty of them specialized in the academic library field in library school.

Table 5

Areas of Concentration in Library School by Respondents (N= 40)

Area of Concentration	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Academic	20	50.0%
Special	9	22.5
Public	6	15.0
School	4	10.0
Medical	1	2.5
None	5	12.5

Last of all is the degrees held by the forty. Other research has shown that most librarians hold degrees in either the humanities or the social sciences; this study does not dispute the fact, having only six degrees in the sciences or applied sciences.

Although biased toward the academic field, the forty librarians interviewed for the study still represent a fairly good cross section of librarians because

Table 6

Degrees Held by Respondents

Degree Held	Number of Respondents
Bachelor's Degrees:	
A.B. Linguistics	1
B.A. Anthropology	1
B.A. Art and Art History	2
B.A. Classics	1
B.A. English	12
B.A. French	1
B.A. German	1
B.A. Geography	1
B.A. History	5
B.A. Humanities	1
B.A. Political Science	2
B.A. Slavic Languages and Literature	1
B.A. Social Science	2
B.S. Biology	3
B.S. Chemistry	1
B.S. Education	3
B.S. Home Economics	1
Master's Degrees:	
M.A. Education	2
M.A. English	2

Table 6 (continued)

Degree Held	Number of Respondents
M.A. French Philology	1
M.A. Geography	1
M.A. History	2
M.A. Political Science	1
M.A. Psychology	1
M.S. Biology	1
M.S. Food Technology	1

of the postions they hold, the library schools they attended, their areas of concentration, and the degrees they hold. The sample was broad enough to get a variety of attitudes toward library education.

The Responses

What course that you took in library school was the most useful in your first years of librarianship? Why? This was the first question having to do with evaluating courses taken during library school. The interviewees listed twenty-six different courses (Table 7) in answer to the question. Similar courses have been grouped together for analysis (Table 8). The course signified by the most respondents as most useful was cataloging, with twenty-

six librarians designating it thus. The reasons given for naming this course fell into two distinct categories: 1) the person's first job was as a cataloger; therefore, he found it very practical, 2) many people found it useful for the knowledge it gave them of classification schemes, organization of materials, subject heading assignments, and how a book is descriptively cataloged. This latter comment came mostly from those working in the reference area.

Another area that was regarded as highly useful was reference, with fifteen people listing basic reference and twenty-four people listing advanced reference courses -- adult reference materials, children's literature, literature of a subject area, government documents, advanced reference, and descriptive bibliography. Librarians responding in this area saw as important a good background in the types of materials available and in-depth knowledge in a certain subject area or area of literature. Also mentioned were the practice in searching techniques carried out by reference librarians and instruction in conducting a reference interview. As with cataloging, many librarians thought these courses most useful because their first job out of library school was in reference.

The third largest area of response was in automation which included courses in cybernetics (1), introduction to information science (3), FORTRAN programming (1),

Table 7

Courses Named Most Useful by Respondents (N= 40)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Cataloging	26	65.0%
Basic Reference	15	37.5
"Literature of" Courses	11	30.0
Automation	6	15.0
Administration (Type of Library)	5	12.5
Government Documents	5	12.5
Research Methods	4	10.0
Children's Literature	3	7.5
Foundations of Librarianship	3	7.5
History of Books and Libraries	3	7.5
Introduction to Information Science	3	7.5
Selection of Materials	3	7.5
Advanced Reference	2	5.0
Library Management	2	5.0
Acquisitions	1	2.5
Adult Reference Materials	1	2.5
American Magazines	1	2.5
Current Issues in Librarianship	1	2.5
Cybernetics	1	2.5
Descriptive Bibliography	1	2.5

Table 7 (continued)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Field Work	1	2.5
FORTRAN Programming	1	2.5
Legislation Dealing with Libraries	1	2.5
Resources in American Libraries	1	2.5
Seminar in Library Administration	1	2.5
All Courses	1	2.5
None	4	10.0

and automation (6). (The number in parentheses indicate the number of librarians naming that course) These courses were considered most useful because libraries are becoming more involved with computers and most of the librarians who named these courses were directly involved with computers. The parts of the courses considered to be of importance were: the introduction to the computer (describing its parts and functions), becoming familiar with computer terminology, learning programming languages,and how they are used, and -- the one most frequently cited -- how computers can be used in libraries and how they are being used now. "Hands-on" practice with computer ter-

minals was also listed as a useful experience.

Another grouping of courses comes under the heading of library administration, with eight librarians citing courses in this group. The courses include administration, seminar in administration, and library management. Respondents felt these courses were useful because they presented principles of administration and management as they applied to libraries. One librarian mentioned the work with problems in administration as being most useful, while two others mentioned budgeting and planning as the most useful aspects of their courses.

All other areas received four responses or less: field work and outreach experience (2), research methods (4), current issues and foundations of librarianship (4), history of books and libraries and American magazines (4), selection of materials (3), acquisitions (1), legislation dealing with libraries (1), and resources in American libraries (1). The four librarians who thought research methods was one of their most useful courses attributed its utility to the knowledge gained in the construction and use of research studies. Selection of materials, acquisitions, and resources in American libraries were thought to be useful for their practical applications to the job of the librarian. One person listed all courses as being useful and four people listed no courses, or no one course, as being most useful.

Table 8

Courses Respondents Named Most Useful
(Grouped by Similarities)(N= 40)

Courses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Cataloging	26	65.0%
Adult Reference Materials Advanced Reference Children's Literature Descriptive Bibliography Government Documents "Literature of" Courses	24	60.0
Basic Reference	15	37.5
Automation Cybernetics FORTRAN Programming Introduction to Information Science	11	27.5
Administration (Type of Library) Library Management Seminar on Library Administration	8	20.0
Research Methods	4	10.0
Current Issues in Librarianship Foundations of Librarianship	4	10.0
American Magazines History of Books and Libraries	4	10.0
Selection of Materials	3	7.5
Field Work Outreach Project	2	5.0
Acquisitions	1	2.5
Legislation Dealing With Libraries	1	2.5
Resources in American Libraries	1	2.5

The responses to this question seem to center around the practical applications of the courses as being the most useful, although there are a few courses that were listed because of their theoretical background. For the most part librarians tended to stress practical aspects.

What courses did you find to be of least use to you? Why? When this question was asked, it was explained to all interviewees that a course could be of least use not only because it did not provide information needed in their jobs, but also because the professor did not present the material well, or was poorly organized, or the content of the course did not seem worthwhile at the time.

The area of course work receiving the most mention was administration, management, and systems analysis. Most of the reasons given for administrative and management courses being least useful dealt with poor presentation and lack of organization on the part of the professor. The professors were severely criticized for not covering the subject adequately and tending to wander off the subject. The single person who listed the systems analysis course as least useful said that she just could not use it in her present job.

Foundations of librarianship and history of librarianship was the next most mentioned area. In this area librarians again were disenchanted with the handling of the courses by the professors, as well as the material

Table 9

Courses Named Least Useful by Respondents (N= 40)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Administration (Type of Library)	10	25.0%
Foundation of Librarianship	6	15.0
History of Books and Libraries	6	15.0
Research Methods	6	15.0
Government Documents	5	12.5
Cataloging	4	10.0
Selection of Materials	3	7.5
Basic Reference	2	5.0
American Magazines	2	5.0
History of Librarianship	2	5.0
Management of Libraries	2	5.0
Advanced Automation	1	2.5
Bibliography	1	2.5
Children's Book Selection	1	2.5
Children's Literature	1	2.5
Collection Development	1	2.5
Computers and Librarianship	1	2.5
Field Work	1	2.5
Indexing	1	2.5
Introduction to Library Science	1	2.5
"Literature of" Courses	1	2.5

Table 9 (continued)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Media Course	1	2.5
Systems Analysis	1	2.5
None	5	12.5

covered. Most mentioned the teaching techniques as being poor with much too much emphasis on the lecture method. Some librarians mentioned that a course with this content should be given at the end of the degree program instead of at the beginning.

The advanced reference course (bibliography, "literature of" courses, government documents, and children's literature) were named by a total of eight librarians. As in the previous two area, librarians seemed to be concerned about the approach taken by the professors. Most felt there was too much of the "show and tell" approach in these courses and not enough individual practice using the reference materials to answer reference questions. A particular criticism voiced about the government documents courses was that they were not specific enough. The librarians said they would like to see more time spent using the indexes to these publiations and more work using the publications themselves to answer

Table 10

Courses Respondents Named Least Useful
(Grouped by Similarities)(N= 40)

Courses	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Administration (Type of Library) Management of Libraries Systems Analysis	13	32.5
Bibliography Children's Literature Government Documents "Literature of" Courses	8	20.0
Foundations of Librarianship History of Librarianship	8	20.0
American Magazines History of Books and Libraries	8	20.0
Research Methods	6	15.0
Children's Book Selection Collection Development Selection of Materials	5	12.5
Advanced Automation Computers and Librarianship Indexing Introduction to Information Science	4	10.0
Cataloging	4	10.0
Basic Reference	2	5.0
Field Work	1	2.5
Media	1	2.5
None	5	12.5

questions typically asked of librarians working with

these government documents. The librarians felt that more work using these documents would give them a better idea of the types of questions that could be answered using particular categories of documents, e.g. Census publications, Bureau of Labor Statistics publications, Public Health Statistics, et cetera.

American magazines and history of books and libraries were also cited by eight librarians. Here almost all librarians referred to the lack of application of the course to the job.

Research methods received six votes for the least useful. The consensus here was that research methods and a research project could not be used in the particular job and was, consequently, not a worthwhile area of course work.

Other areas mentioned were book selection and collection development (4), basic reference (2), automation courses (4), cataloging (4), media (1), and field work (1). In all of these areas the most prevalent comment was the poor quality of the course -- either the professor's presentation was poor or the material in the course was not worthwhile. Two librarians who mentioned cataloging as a least useful course differed from the above opinions saying that their cataloging courses were not specific enough about practical cataloging procedures.

In a majority of cases criticisms of courses

fell on the professor. Teaching methods and choices of course content were severely criticized. The librarians thought that too much emphasis was placed upon the lecture method and other methods such as the use of video tapes, role playing, and case study should be used more often. The criticism of course content centered upon the lack of up-to-date material in the courses which paralleled another comment that professors in library school were not aware of was going on in today's libraries. In the rest of the cases librarians listed a course they could not apply to their jobs. There were five librarians who listed none of their courses as least useful.

What areas of your work do you feel should have been covered by course work in library school, but were not? With this question it was explained to respondents that the areas they listed did not have to be large areas that would naturally constitute entire courses, but could be anything which they felt should have been covered.

The number one area listed in response to this question was what shall be referred to here as special subjects or topics. For the most part they are topics that are covered superficially (sometimes not at all) in courses. The areas included rare books, serials, vertical file, maintaining a technical reports collection, acquisitions/ordering, care of materials, law bibliography, business reference, branch work (public), non-print

Table 11

Areas Named by Respondents as Not Covered in Library School (N= 40)

Areas	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Management/Supervision	12	30.0%
Automation	9	22.5
Interpersonal Relations	6	15.0
Acquisitions and Ordering	5	12.5
Professionalism	5	12.5
Cataloging	4	10.0
Accounting/Budgeting	3	7.5
Field Work	3	7.5
Reference Interview	3	7.5
Selection of Materials	3	7.5
Serials	3	7.5
Business Reference	2	5.0
Current Problems and Trends in Libraries	2	5.0
Law Bibliography	2	5.0
Oral Communication	2	5.0
Public relations/publicity	2	5.0
Architecture and Floor Planning	1	2.5
Assessing Community Needs	1	2.5
Bibliography	1	2.5
Branch Work (Public Library)	1	2.5

Table 11 (continued)

Areas	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Care of Materials	1	2.5
Catalog Structure	1	2.5
Censorship	1	2.5
Child Psychology	1	2.5
Evaluation and Construction of Forms	1	2.5
How to Get a Job	1	2.5
Maintaining a Technical Reports Collection	1	2.5
Non-print Media	1	2.5
Other Agencies available for Information/Networks	1	2.5
Rare Books	1	2.5
Systmes Analysis	1	2.5
Teaching People How to Use the Library	1	2.5
Types of Programs Offered by Libraries	1	2.5
Vertical File	1	2.5
None	3	7.5

media, and agencies where other information can be obtained. The comments about these areas concerned the need on the job for knowledge in these subjects, and

inability to get such courses in library school. Serials and acquisitions/ordering were the two biggest single areas mentioned (total of eight); the librarians were most vehement about the lack of adequate training to perform these jobs in a library situation.

The next most cited area was management/supervision. As a single topic it received more mention than any other single course on the list; coupled with related areas, it was a very heavily discussed topic. The librarians who named this area were concerned about the lack of training received in management fundamentals and voiced opinions about the need for course work in management theory. Planning and evaluating were also referred to as areas within management that needed to be emphasized -- especially accounting/budgeting and planning of work and work space.

Working with people was another area that received quite a bit of comment. Interpersonal relations (being able to work well with others on the staff) was mentioned most in this group. One person recommended a course in transactional analysis so people could better understand each other. Also cited in this group was the need for more training in the reference interview. Three librarians felt that the topic was not covered sufficiently in their course work and should be stressed more. A psychology course was named by one person as a possibility

Table 12

Areas Named by Respondents as
Not Covered in Library School
(Grouped by Similarities)
(N= 40)

Areas	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Acquisitions/Ordering Branch Work (Public Library) Business Reference Care of Materials Law Bibliography Maintaing a Technical Reprots Collection Non-print Media Other Agencies Available for Information/Networks Rare Books Serials Vertical File	19	47.5%
Accounting/Budgeting Architecture and Floor Planning Evaluation and Construction of Forms Management/Supervision Systems Analysis	18	45.0
Child Psychology Interpersonal Relations Oral Communication Reference Interview Teaching People How to Use the Library	13	32.5
Automation	9	22.5
Catalog Structure Cataloging	5	12.5
Professionalism	5	12.5

Table 12 (continued)

Areas	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Censorship Current Problems and Trends in Libraries Types of Programs Offered in Libraries	4	10.0
Field Work	3	7.5
Selection of Materials	3	7.5
Bibliography	1	2.5
How to Get a Job	1	2.5
Non-print Media	1	2.5

for fulfulling the need in this area.

As would be expected in these days when automation is starting to make an impact on libraries, some of the librarians interviewed were concerned about their lack of knowledge in this area and felt that it should be covered in library school. The topics within the course should include an introduction to computers and computer terminology, some fundamentals of programming, applications of computers to libraries, and how they are being used in libraries at present. Another aspect that was emphasized was "hands-on" experience with computer terminals to get a better idea of the symbology that one

encounters when using computer terminals.

After automation, cataloging was the next most mentioned area which is somewhat surprising since twenty-six librarians cited it as their most useful course. The librarians who did list this area thought that more depth was needed in the courses, especially in the more specialized areas such as non-print materials and maps. One librarian listed the area of files and file management here, saying that librarians should have a better idea of the way files are set up and how one file relates to another.

An interesting area that librarians felt was not covered in library school was professionalism. Many respondents were concerned about these questions: What is a professional librarian?, What kinds of duties does he perform or not perform?, What is expected of a professional?, What are his relationships with non-professional and clerical workers? Most librarians said that the word "professional" was often referred to but rarely discussed or defined, and that this omission left the librarian wondering just where he stood as a professional.

An area that seemed to be of concern to the public librarians was problems and trends in public libraries. The four librarians who cited this area said that "problem patrons" are encountered by the beginning librarian, and he is not very well prepared to deal with such people. One librarian specifically named censorship as an area that should be covered.

Also of concern to the public librarians was working with the community. The topics referred to here were public relations/publicity and assessing community needs.

Three other topics received mention: field work (3), selection of materials (1), and how to get a job (1). The librarians who cited field work thought that this was an important part of library education. More will be said about this area in the next section.

In summary, many areas were mentioned by the respondents as not being covered in library course work but four seem most prominent: specialized courses dealing with special topics were of most concern, with acquisitions/ordering and serials work being specifically referred to most often. Management/supervision was also frequently listed. How to deal with people was the third most common area and automation was fourth.

Did you participate in field work? Do you think field work would be useful for any library school student? These two questions on field work produced some interesting responses. The first question's purpose was to find out how many people had participated in field work in library school. Eleven librarians (27.5%) participated in field work in library school, while twenty-nine (72.5%) did not. In answer to the second question thirty-nine

Table 13

Did Respondent Participate
in Field Work (N= 40)

Answer	Number of Respondents
Yes	11
No	29

(97.5%), responded positively with one librarian having no opinion. The answers to this question were most emphatic. Many librarians expressed the opinion that this was the one place where the library school student could see exactly what a librarian does. The experience gained in field work was also stressed by many of the librarians.

Table 14

Would Field Work Be Useful
for Any Library Student
(N= 40)

Answer	Number of Respondents
Yes	39
No	0
No opinion	1

Some librarians did qualify their positive responses by saying that it would be useful only to those that had not previously worked in a library. One person expressed the opinion that field work should be done early during library school so the person could evaluate whether he really wanted to be a librarian. Another said that the field work experience should include experience in different types of libraries so that the student could make a more intelligent choice on which area of librarianship he wanted to pursue. The most important aspect of the answers to these questions was the overwhelming majority of librarians who thought field work is important to a library school student.

In your opinion is the present calendar year program used by most library schools a sufficiently long enough program to train a beginning librarian? Would you favor a four semester/six quarter program? These two questions were aimed at ascertaining opinions on the desired length of the library school curriculum. Thirty-one (77.5%) thought the present length was long enough, with eight (20.5%) disagreeing. Of those who disagreed, one thought it too short. The prevailing comment on this question was that the program was definitely long enough, especially if the time were put to better use. The comment paralleled those from the least useful courses question in that the respondents felt that the professors could organize courses

much better, present more meaningful material, and manage their time better.

Table 15

Is a Calendar Year Long Enough For Library School? (N= 40)

Responses	Number of Respondents
Yes	31
No	8
Too Long	1

The answers to the second question were quite interesting with nineteen (47.5%) favoring it, eighteen (45.0%) against, and three (7.5%) having no opinion. The librarians who favored such a program felt that a program of this length could be used for more specialization within a specific area of librarianship or an increase in the amount of field work experience. Those against the proposition stated that, for the most part, it would waste time that might better be used for getting a job and starting to work. One librarian made a comment that was most interesting. He felt that a two year program would be beneficial if it included course work towards a second masters degree. In fact, his proposal was for a one year B.A. in librarianship and a one year

Table 16

Would a Four Semester/Six Quarter Program Be Beneficial? (N= 40)

Responses	Number of Respondents
Yes	19
No	18
No opinion	3

M.A. in a subject area. The most important result of these questions was the fact that most librarians thought the present program was long enough, although many (almost 50%) also thought a two-year program might be beneficial.

Which courses, if any, should be required of all library students? Why? In response to this question the librarians were unanimous agreement that at least one course should be required of all library students. There was no such overwhelming agreement on which courses they should be: respondents named twenty-four different courses. Two courses stood out as most nearly unanimous choices: cataloging (36) and basic reference (33). It was felt that both of these courses contained material basic to librarianship -- the reference course as an introduction to the types of materials available for answering ques-

Table 17

Courses Respondents Thought Should Be Required (N= 40)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Cataloging	36	90.0%
Basic Reference	33	82.5
Atuomation	12	30.0
Introduction to Librarianship	10	25.0
Management/Supervision	7	17.5
Administration (Type of library)	6	15.0
Selection of Materials	6	15.0
History of Libraries	6	15.0
"Literature of" Courses	4	10.0
Acquisitions	3	7.5
Audio-visual Equipment	3	7.5
Field Work	2	5.0
Research Methods	2	5.0
Advanced Reference	1	2.5
All "Literature of" Courses	1	2.5
Care of Materials	1	2.5
Children's Literature	1	2.5
Government Documents	1	2.5
History of Books	1	2.5
History of Communications	1	2.5

Table 17 (continued)

Course	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Library Management and Building Planning	1	2.5%
Oral Communication	1	2.5
Problems in Libraries	1	2.5

tions, and as a means of pointing out specific courses that are well known and widely used. Also this course should contain a thorough study of the use and application of the reference interview. Respondents said the cataloging course should contain theoretical background on the organization and classification of knowledge, with a superficial look at the structure of the most popular classification schemes -- especially Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress. Practical experience in the cataloging of all types of materials was also seen as a necessary part of this course.

The third most popular course was automation (12). Respondents said they cited this course because libraries of all types are heading toward automation at a very rapid pace. The class was seen as an introduction to the computer and computer terminology, but more importantly, as a presentation of the applicability of computers to li-

braries. In addition, material on how computers are being used today in libraries should be included.

Introduction to librarianship was the fourth most popular required course (9). This course was seen as an overview of what a librarian is and does. Also included would be what different types of libraries do. Professionalism comes into play here too; those who expressed a need for a discussion of professionalism wanted it included in this course. The history of librarianship was mentioned as a possible subject for this course as was associations in the profession and what they do.

A course in management/supervision was named by seven librarians as one that should be required of all library students. A distinction should be made here between a course on administration of a certain type of library and one on management/supervision. Those talking of management/supervision were most interested in the theoretical principles of management and supervision as they apply in general, while those that talked of an administration course were more interested in the use of management as it applied to a certain type of library. These two courses were named by almost the same number of librarians, but are distinctly different.

A course in the selection of materials was listed by six librarians. This course would include selection criteria as they apply to all types of material, both

print and non-print. Two librarians also mentioned including ordering procedures in this course.

Seven librarians thought an advanced reference course should be required. One thought the course should be interdisciplinary in nature while another thought all of the "literature of" courses (science, social science, and humanities) should be required. The rest expressed the view that at least one of the subject literature courses sould be required to give a student more in-depth knowledge of the reference tools in at least one subject field.

History of libraries received five votes for a required course. Those who referred to this course thought it would provide a background in the development of libraries up to the modern day and give the student a good idea of where libraries fit into society.

Two courses were cited by three librarians each: audio-visual equipment and acquisitions. A course in audio-visual equipment was seen as including both hardware and software, and covering all aspects of the area -- evaluation, selection, cataloging, and use. Acquisitions would include ordering, vendors, and approval plans, with some work in evaluating and comparing acquisition methods and techniques.

Other courses which received mention from one or two librarians included oral communication, problems in

libraries, history of communition, field work, research methods, government documents, library architecture and building planning, care of materials, history of books, and children's literature.

The courses receiving the most mention as required courses were, in many cases, the same ones mentioned as most useful, or as areas not covered: basic reference, cataloging, automation, introduction to librarianship, and management/supervision. The first two were the only ones close to being unanimous choices.

Overall how would you rate your library education as it related to preparing you for your first years in librarianship? Twenty-four librarians (60%) rated their library school education as good or better, while sixteen (40%) rated it as adequate or worse. Reasons given by those who rated their education good or below were much the same as reasons given for courses not being useful. Many thought the time was poorly utilized in specific courses and that the organization of courses in general needed to be improved. Those who rated their education as very good or better, thought they had received a good foundation with which to pursue their careers.

Do you have any other comments about library education? For the reader to get an idea of the comments, they are listed in paraphrased form:

Table 18

How Respondents Rated Their Library School Education (N= 40)

Rating	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Overqualified	1	2.5%
Excellent	3	7.5
Very Good	7	17.5
Good	13	32.5
Fair	3	7.5
Adequate	5	12.5
Mediocre	2	5.0
Poor	5	12.5
Barely Adequate	1	2.5

Instructors should keep up with what is going on in the field by keeping better contact with libraries. A few intense courses and an apprenticeship program would be more valuable than just formal course work. Students are not taught to think professionally. I would like to see a mock library in which role playing could be conducted.

There is too much emphasis on writing and bibliography, and not enough on oral communication. I would favor a program of experience/field work with a final qualifying exam instead of course work.

There is too much busy work with no clear purpose. There is not enough contact with working librarians. There is no need to put so much emphasis on research.

The course work was not very practical, but theory is good for an overview of library work.

The quality of teaching methods and content of courses needs to be improved. Faculty should have opportunities to see what is going on in libraries through the use of sabbatical leaves.

Concentration in a specific area of librarianship is better than a general smattering in all areas.

Professors never explained why librarianship is professional and why it requires a master's degree. More detailed training is needed in subject area literature. Automation should be included in the program with course work in data bases, computers, and computer applications to libraries. We need more practical work and less theory.

I would like to see a bachelor's degree offered in library science and a M.A. in a subject area or special aspect of librarianship. More detailed course work should be available on ordering, vendors, acquisitions, and serials. Library schools should be more attuned with what is happening in libraries. It would be useful for the student to get more information on the areas in which libraries operate, e.g., higher education, urban and city problems, etc.

Library schools should require courses outside library school -- expecially business. The quality of the faculty is poor; they were not successful librarians so they became teachers and were not well prepared to teach. There is too much emphasis on essay exams.

Instructors need to be more up-to-date on what is going on in libraries. Departments should require instructors to work in a library every couple years.

More interdisciplinary programs should be offered so people can go into other professions if they do not like librarianship -- e.g., business/librarianship, publishing/librarianship. Library schools should be open to people who are not going to be librarians so they can benefit from some of the specialized library courses.

The foundation of librarianship course should start the student thinking about philosophies and theories of librarianship to better define professionalism. The course work should emphasize the practical aspects of librarianship.

Library school should teach people how to think and analyze.

Librarians need to change the image that the public has of them and educate the public about what librarians do.

Enrollment in library school should not be curtailed because of the job situation. People who do not want to be librarians should be afforded the opportunity to take some library courses just to gain knowledge of library materials. Programs should also be open to library assistants and technicians, even though they are not going for the degree, so they could learn more about libraries.

Schools should specialize in areas of preparation so a student would know that one school will prepare him for a particular kind of job in librarianship. There should be more discussion of professional organizations and their roles in librarianship. More information should be available on hiring requirements and how to advance in the field.

More time should be devoted to problems in librarianship -- e.g., centralization versus decentralization of reference areas, handling of media, and the question of separating periodicals from book collections. Library school students should put more thought into where they are going as librarians and the options available to them if they do not want to stay in librarianship. More discussion is needed about how people are promoted and career patterns for librarians. There should be a close relationship between the library school and the university library and between the library staff and library school professors.

More emphasis should be placed on practical aspects of librarianship, which can be best learned through work experience. An intern program would be a real advantage. An improvement is needed in the quality of both the professors and the courses.

Library school cannot prepare a student to step right into a job. There needs to be better organization of course content, and a variety of teaching methods. Professors are not familiar with a variety of teaching techniques.

There should be a balance between the practical and the theoretical.

Students should be encouraged to take courses outside the library school.

The practical and theoretical should be balanced, with lectures presenting the theoretical and discussion emphasizing the practical. Library school is the only place the sudent will get exposure to the theoretical.

Teaching methods of the professors should be varied, not all lecture. Curriculum content should concentrate on the theoretical with practical things being learned on the job.

Knowledge of foreign languages should be required of all students. There was not enough individual attention to students.

A Ph.D. in librarianship is a waste of time; there is not enough content to sustain it. Most of the real learning takes place on the job, not in library school. Library school does not promote professionalism. Professors should spend more time finding out what is presently going on in libraries.

Professors should foster more contact with "real world" librarianship. Field work should be emphasized and school work should be oriented to the practical, not theoretical; There should be more feedback in library school about how people got their jobs.

Libraianship is a second-rate academic discipline and does not rate a master's degree. A second master's degree is not that important in library work. Library school is something to go through to get a job. Automation should be stressed since this is the future of libraries.

Library schools should emphasize the basics -- cataloging and reference -- with specializations learned on the job. More training is needed in management and administration, especially in how to supervise. More can be learned from people who are working in libraries than from course work.

Atuomation should be emphasized.

Courses should be at the p[illegible]er level for

the student. Courses should be better organized with less waste of time. Cut down on duplication among courses. Instructors should be required to have recent experience in library work.

There is too much of an "ivory-tower" attitude in library school and not enough about what really goes on in libraries. There was no definition given of what a librarian really is, especially in relationship to professionalism.

"Mickey Mouse" type assignments were too prevalent. Reference searches were a bit childish.

No idea is given to the student about the management and supervision responsibilities a librarian incurs.

Students should be free to choose their own programs. More information is needed by students on the career options available to them.

Library schools should offer formal continuing education programs, especially in automation and management.

Good courses are needed in the area of audio-visual materials. Management and personnel relations need to be covered in library school.

Modern trends should affect the teaching of library school courses so students will be informed on what is currently happening in libraries.

Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the first chapter of this paper the hypothesis was stated:

> PRACTICING LIBRARIANS CAN PROVIDE THE INFORMATION NEEDED TO ENABLE LIBRARY EDUCATORS TO CHANGE AND IMPROVE LIBRARY SCHOOL CURRICULA.

To test this hypotheseis a survey of forty librarians was taken in the southern San Francisco Bay Area. They were asked questions about the usefulness of their course work as it applied to their jobs and about three issues that face library education today: The usefulness of field work, the optimum length of the master's degree program, and the need for required courses.

The following conclusions and recommendations were reached from their responses.

Library education is doing an adequate job of preparing librarians for work in libraries, as evidenced by the fact that 60% of the respondents in this survey rate their library school education good or better.

Field work is very beneficial in a library school program especially for those with no previous library experience.

The present length of one calendar year is long enough for a master's degree program, but the time needs to be used more effectively.

A core curriculum of basic reference and cataloging (including Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress) is favored by a vast majority of librarians.

There should be a balance between the practical and theoretical work offered by the library school.

Professors should be allowed and encouraged to take sabbaticals to work in libraries and update their knowledge of changes that have taken place in libraries.

The teaching techniques of professors should be more varied and attuned to the students' needs. The lecture method is depended upon too much in teaching library school courses and other methods such as role playing, use of video tape, and case study should be used more.

A course in management that covers its theories, principles and practices needs to be offered; students should be made aware of the increasing importance management is playing in the library. Also it should be emphasized to the student that he will incur management responsibilities in his first job as a librarian.

Any course or courses in automation should include what a computer is, what it does, the terminology involved with it, possible applications of computers to libraries (both practical and theoretical), how computers are being used in libraries today, and "hands-on" experience utilizing a computer terminal to perform bibliographic searches.

More courses should be offered in specialized areas of librarianship, especially in acquisitions and serials work. Many librarians are unprepared to handle these jobs in libraries due to a lack of any knowledge in these areas.

Chapter 5

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

During this study, ideas for other areas of research have surfaced: a study similar to this one would be useful if it focused on just one aspect of librarianship instead of all three -- academic, public, and special. A study centering only on one type of librarianship could broaden its coverage and scope, and provide additional information on a rather small area.

Since curriculums of each library school differ it would be advantageous to devote the study to graduates of one school to find out how well one particular curriculum prepares librarians for their jobs.

An interesting study could center around finding out how long a period of time library school education prepares a librarian for and where continuing education takes over.

More work needs to be done along the lines of the Hall study to determine what skills and knowledge are needed by librarians on their jobs, so that library schools might have something with which to compare their course content.

A study from the employer's point of view would also be helpful, to see what they, as a group, feel to be the most important areas in which a librarian should receive training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atherton, Pauline. "Putting Knowledge to Work in Today's Library Schools." Special Libraries, January, 1972, pp. 31-36.

Belzer, Jack and James W. Brown. Needs for Improvement of Professional Education in Library and Information Science. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 087479, 1973.

Boaz, Martha, ed. Toward the Improvement of Library Education. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1973.

Borko, Harold, ed. Targets for Research in Library Education. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Bramley, Gerald. World Trends in Library Education. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet, 1975.

Brunelle, Eugene A. "New Learning, New Libraries, New Librarians." Journal of Academic Librarianship, November, 1975, pp. 20-24.

Bundy, Mary Lee. "Crisis in Library Education." Library Journal, March 1, 1971, pp. 797-800.

Dalton, Jack. "Library Education and Research in Librarianship." Libri, November 3, 1969, pp. 157-174.

"Education for Librarianship." Cornell University Libraries Bulletin, January/February, 1972.

"Education for Librarianship: A New Approach to Core." Drexel Library Quarterly, July, 1974, pp. 1-106.

Ely, Donald P. Future Training for Service: A Report to the Library and Information Science Profession. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 098940, 1974.

Evans, G. Edward. "An Historical Note Relating to Library Degrees and the Two Year Program." Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring, 1971, pp. 308-324.

Galvin, Thomas J. "The Education of the New Reference Librarian." Library Journal, April 15, 1975, pp. 727-730.

Garrison, Guy. "Library Education and the Public Library." Library Journal, September 1, 1970, pp. 2763-2767.

Goh, H.P. "Current Problems in Library Training with a Proposal for a Curriculum." Libri, 4 (1974), pp. 143-152.

Goldhor, Herbert. Education for Librarianship: The Design of the Curriculum of Library Schools. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1971.

Hall, Anna C. Selected Educational Objectives for Public Service Librarians: A Taxonomic Approach. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1968.

Hershfield, Allan F. Effecting Change in Library Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 082778, 1973.

Hug, William E., ed. Strategies for Change in Information Programs. New York: Bowker, 1974.

Hurst, Don. "An Experimental Course in Library Data Processing." Oklahoma Librarian, January, 1975, pp. 4-9.

Institute on Information Needs and Library Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 089654, 1972.

Kortendick, James J. and Elizabeth W. Stone. Job Dimensions and Educational Needs in Librarianship. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.

Lankin, Burton E. "Toward a Federal Strategy in Library Training." American Libraries, May, 1971, pp. 496-499.

"Library Education and Manpower." American Libraries, April, 1970, pp. 341-344.

Mariani, Doris. "The Library School Curriculum -- Is it Relevant?" PLA Bulletin, September, 1970, pp. 269-277.

Meadow, Charles T. On Information Science Education: A Rebellious View. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 101738, 1974.

Neill, Samuel D. "Who Needs to Go to a Graduate Library School?" Journal of Education for Librarianship, Spring, 1973, pp. 212-225.

Reece, Ernest J. The Curriculum in Library Schools. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Shera, Jesse H. The Foundations of Education for Librarianship. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.

Shields, Gerald R. "Out Standing in the Field." Library Journal, February 15, 1975, p. 373.

Taylor, Robert S. Curriculum Design for Library and Information Science. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 082779, 1973.

Taylor, Robert S. Manpower and Educational Programs for Management, Research, and Professional Growth in Library and Information Services. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100392, 1974.

Wheeler, Joseph L. Progress and Problems in Education for Librarianship. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1946.

White, Rodney F. and David B. Macklin. Education, Careers, and Professionalization in Librarianship and Information Science. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 054800, 1970.

Williamson, Charles C. Training for Library Service. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1923.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What type of library are you now working in?
2. What position do you hold in that library?
3. How long have you been in that position?
4. How many years have you been a professional librarian?
5. What library school did you attend?
6. What year did you graduate from library school?
7. What was your area of concentration in library school?
8. What other degrees besides librarianship do you hold? (Include both bachelors and masters)
9. What courses that you took in library school were the most helpful to you in your first years of librarianship? Why?
10. Which courses did you find to be of least use to you? Why?
11. What areas of your work do you feel should have been covered by course work in library school but were not?
12. Did you participate in field work?
13. Do you think field work would be useful for any library student?
14. In your opinion is the present calendar year program used by most library schools a sufficiently long enough program to train a beginning librarian?
15. Would you favor a four semester/six quarter program?

16. Which courses should be required to be taken by all library students? Why?

17. Overall how would you rate your library school education as it related to preparing you for your first years in librarianship?

18. Do you have any other comments about library education?